UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2496th MEETING: 11 NOVEMBER 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2496)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East: Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/16036)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2496th MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 11 November 1983, at 4 p.m.

President: Mr. Victor J. GAUCI (Malta).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2496)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in the Middle East:
   Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/16036)

The meeting was called to order at 4.40 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/16036)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at the previous meetings on this item, at the 2480th and 2495th meetings, I invite the representatives of Lebanon and Israel to take places at the Council table; I invite the representatives of the Sudan and the Syrian Arab Republic to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Fakhoury (Lebanon) and Mr. Blum (Israel) took places at the Council table; Mr. Abdalla (Sudan) and Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: Before we hear the first speaker, I have been authorized by the members of the Council to make the following statement on their behalf:

> "The members of the Security Council wish to express their profound concern at the recent and current developments in northern Lebanon which have caused and are still causing widespread suffering and loss of human life. The members appeal to all parties concerned to exercise the utmost restraint and freely to seek to attain, and to respect, an immediate cessation of hostilities, to settle their differences exclusively by peaceful means and to refrain from the threat or use of force. The members of the Council highly appreciate the work of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East and of the International Committee of the Red Cross in providing emergency humanitarian assistance to Palestinian and Lebanese civilians in and around the city of Tripoli. The members of the Council will continue to follow the situation in Lebanon with the greatest attention." *[S/16142.]*

3. The first speaker is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

4. Mr. El-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): At the outset, Sir, I should like to express our great pleasure at your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. Your well-known extensive and accurate knowledge of international affairs, including the problem of the Middle East and especially the question of Palestine, assures us that, thanks to your wisdom and objectivity, you are eminently qualified to conduct the deliberations of the Council in a manner that will help it to discharge its commitments under the Charter of the United Nations before the international community. Your country may be small in area but its contribution in building a world culture cannot be measured simply by geographical size. The friendship binding our two countries makes us proud of your presence both as President of the Council and outside it.

5. I also take this opportunity to express to my colleague, Mr. Abdullah Salah of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, our great appreciation of the judicious, objective and courageous manner in which he conducted the work of the Council at a time when the majority of its membership was trying to oppose imperialist practices in Latin America, Africa and the Middle East. We are proud of his presidency. There is a colloquial Arab verse which goes, "If I am disparaged by a knave, this speaks most eloquently for my perfection".

6. We have heard disparagement today and we are proud of the Arab representative who represents the Group of Arab States on the Council. Members know very well who the critic was who made the disparaging remarks. If you hear a knave disparaging me, this speaks most 'eloquently for my perfection'.

7. It has been said in the Council [*2495th meeting, para. 32*] that the President behaved in a certain way in 1954. In 1954 Israel was not in occupation of the whole of Pales-

tine; it was not in occupation of the Golan Heights; it was not in occupation of the Gaza Strip, the West Bank and southern Lebanon. This is the difference. If Charles Malik, despite our reservations, had been in the presidency instead of the representative from Jordan he would have behaved in the same judicious and objective way.

8. If there is anything we hold against the Council it is that we expected the United States, when the question of Grenada was before the Council, not to take part in the voting inasmuch as it carried out the invasion and an invading State cannot participate in the voting. This is our understanding of the Charter and of, I think, Article 27. A State that is party to an aggression or conflict cannot vote in the Council. That is our reservation. Naturally the representative of zionism here, through his immediate superior, Mr. Shamir, publicly supported the invasion of Grenada. The statements are before us. If we are to be objective, delegations of States that commit aggression should not participate in the voting and thus demonstrate to us their objectivity.

9. As we said in a previous meeting, the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic did not want to speak on the occasion of the extension of the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL). At the time, we responded to the Israeli statement made during the 2480th meeting of the Council, held on 18 October, which was replete with misinformation.

10. Today, the Syrian Arab Republic is the subject of another feverish campaign which is different from its predecessors only in the determination to create various pretexts to avoid the implementation of Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982). Resolution 509 (1982) demands that Israel withdraw all its military forces forthwith and unconditionally from all Lebanese territory to the internationally recognized boundaries.

11. We have asked to be allowed to speak at a very critical moment. American circles are unleashing direct threats at various levels. Those threats presage a joint Israeli-American aggression against Syria, Syrian forces and Lebanon. There is no doubt that you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Council have been concerned at statements accompanied by acts of aggression against Syrian forces and Lebanon's sovereignty. No doubt, the Council as the body charged with the maintenance of international peace and security must have thought that those threats and provocations against the Syrian Arab Republic threaten not only our security in Syria, Lebanon or the region but also international peace and security as a whole. The Council no doubt realizes that the threat to international peace and security in the Middle East region will have direct far-reaching effects on the interests of all the peoples of the world and especially the interests of the Western States.

12. Today the Eastern Mediterranean region is witnessing the mobilization of the largest American armada seen by the world since the Second World War. There are no fewer than 30 warships that have assumed an aggressive posture in Lebanon's coastal waters, 3 aircraft-carriers and 300 sophisticated warplanes. Representatives must have wondered about what is behind the presence of these large numbers. We must have all wondered why this should happen when the Lebanese factions are earnestly doing their utmost to achieve a national consensus in order to put an end to the civil war.

13. What is striking is that the American mobilization and the provocations accompanying it are timed to coincide with Israeli mobilization, in addition to the irresponsible threats that sometimes amount to madness—all of which are actions designed to undermine the process of Lebanese national consensus, a consensus which is considered a prequisite for reviving Lebanon and saving it from the anarchy from which it has been suffering in the wake of the Israeli aggression that started on 4 January 1982 and still continues.

14. Naturally, I cannot speak for the representative of Lebanon, who is here. I was scheduled to speak after him.

15. The show of force, whether by Israel or the United States, is a threat to the security of Lebanon, Syria and the Arab region. In addition, it is an attempt to undermine the independence, unity and sovereignty of Lebanon. It is an encouragement to Israel to persist in its occupation of southern Lebanon. Israel has actually taken measures to separate occupied southern Lebanon from the rest of the country, even in the theatre of operations, which indicates that Israel is putting the final touches on its expansionist schemes in the area. These schemes are not new to representatives; they were laid down during the First World War and presented as an integrated scheme for expansion in Lebanon, Syria and Jordan at the Versailles Peace Conference in 1919. The details of this scheme were published in 1954 in Sharett's memoirs about the period. We have already indicated in the Council the details of the Zionist scheme aimed at the annexation of southern Lebanon and need not repeat them now.

16. In addition to all those facts, which are an open secret, the representative of zionism sets himself up, falsely and fradulently, as a defender of Lebanon and of its independence and sovereignty. Thus, he changes the Council's demand, in its unanimously adopted resolution 509 (1982), that Israel withdraw forthwith and unconditionally into what he called, in his statement at the 2480th meeting of the Council, the unconditional and immediate withdrawal of the non-Lebanese forces. In other words, he arrogates to Israel the right to occupy parts of Lebanon and place Lebanon in a subservient status, in accordance with an agreement rejected by the Lebanese and Arab peoples. That agreement was imposed upon the Lebanese people by force of arms—and that is no secret.

17. We have repeatedly declared that we will not leave Lebanon an easy prey for Israel. We have repeatedly declared that Syrian forces will not withdraw from Lebanon until the last Israeli soldier has been withdrawn unconditionally, and the independence and unity of Lebanon, as an integral part of the Arab nation in the full sense of the word, has been guaranteed.

18. Actually, the Geneva talks among the Lebanese parties have reached that conclusion, since Lebanon can only be Arab, in accordance with its real identity, not the American or Israeli identity which imperialism is trying to impose upon it by force through occupation and multinational aggression.

19. The conspiracy which is being hatched against Lebanon and Syria was recently outlined in the wake of the visit to Israel of Eagleburger, the Under-Secretary for Political Affairs of the United States Department of State. There is a so-called revived strategic agreement with Israel. Israel is the base for American imperialism, and America is the leader of this imperialism. The strategic co-operation agreement did not die and does not need revival, yet it is said that it is to be revived. That means escalating the strategic co-operation to the stage of aggression. That is our concept of this strategic co-operation and its revival.

20. This agreement is based on an understanding between the two parties to commit an imminent aggression, co-ordinated between Washington and Tel Aviv, against the bastion of Arab steadfastness embodied in Syria and against the nationalist forces in Lebanon. The recent American aerial provocations are but a link in the series of terrorist acts committed in deed and in words against our Arab people in our area. We say to America and Israel that Syria is not Grenada, which was an easy prey, and that we shall defend our Arab land and the dignity of our nation with all our might. We are certain that the United States of America, which is behaving in an irresponsible, reckless manner, will not achieve its aims. Our history is replete with evidence that all aggressors have been repelled. We are certain also that all the peoples of the world will stand by us and support us against this new imperialist onslaught, and that the new Arab solidarity will soon emerge and prove itself once more. Our Arab nation is fully conscious of the risks attendant on the return of the Arab homeland to the American sphere of influence. It is the influence of exploitation, oppression, Zionist expansion, the plunder of Arab riches, the humiliation of peoples and the imposition of restrictions on their liberty.

21. In brief, our Foreign Minister speaking in the General Assembly on 28 September this year stated our clear position, which is based on the following principles:

> "First, Lebanon's unity, independence and sovereignty are among the principles whose violation or infringement can never be accepted by Syria and the other Arab States. The Arab States will keep working towards that end and assisting the brotherly Lebanese people to recover their national unity and independence and sovereignty over all their territories. In this regard, we contributed to the achievement of the agreement concluded a few days ago between the opposing sides in the civil war in Lebanon. Secondly, Israel must withdraw unconditionally from Lebanon, in accordance with Security Council resolution 509 (1982). Thirdly, the agreement imposed on Lebanon must be overturned, since this agreement was imposed under the shadow of occupation. Any agreement imposed under occupation or through the use or threat of force is considered null and void. In this connection, it must be pointed out that no attempt of any kind to bring about the implementation of this ill-omened agreement can succeed. We shall stand by our people in Lebanon in their struggle until that agreement is thwarted. Fourthly, the multinational forces must leave Lebanon, because they have gone beyond their declared objectives and are posing a grave threat to peace and security in the region. They remind us of the colonialist expeditions in previous stages of the history of our region."[1]

22. Mr. LICHENSTEIN (United States of America): It is a particular pleasure, Sir, for my delegation to welcome you, both personally and as a representative of a small but important Member State of the United Nations, to the presidency of the Council, for this month. You have so often and in so many ways demonstrated your prudence, your wisdom and your skill that we look forward to your presidency as a productive one and one that will reflect credit on yourself, your country and the Council.

23. I wish also to express the warm thanks and the keen and genuine admiration of my delegation to your predecessor, the representative of Jordan, who presided over one of the most difficult, one of the most exhausting, agendas that has ever befallen the Council in the several years that I personally have been a participant. As we have so often said before, you have a tough act to follow and we wish you well.

24. My delegation had, probably naively, assumed that the thrust of today's meeting would be a follow-up and completion of our consideration last month of the renewal of the mandate of UNIFIL or that it might concern itself with certain procedural problems that were left hanging at the conclusion of the deliberations, or both, but owing to the tender mercies of, particularly, the representative of the Soviet Union and also more recently of the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, the focus of our discussion has gone rather far afield. I wish to comment on only one or two aspects of their statements.

25. The representative of the Soviet Union spoke this morning of the "demonstration of military muscle" by my Government [*ibid., para. 47*]. He and the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic have referred to "threats", "provocative acts" and "intimidation" by my Government. We threaten no one. We engage in no provocative acts. As for intimidation, of course, intimidation is largely in the eye of the beholder and indeed in the backbone of the observer. I leave the question of intimidation to others.

26. We listened carefully to the statements made by the representatives of those two Governments as regards threats, provocation and intimidation, as we always listen carefully to the words uttered by experts in the matters that they address, words uttered by those well practised in threats, provocation and intimidation.

27. I have said that we threaten no one and we intend no provocation. But my Government would wish no one to be misled, would wish no one to misunderstand our intentions in Lebanon. And we would not wish anyone to mis-

understand our resolve in fulfilling our intentions. The forces of the United States are present in Lebanon at the express invitation of the Government of Lebanon; their purpose in Lebanon, along with the forces of three other countries, is simply stated: it is to work with that Government and to assist it in every way possible in the rebuilding of its domestic institutions and in the extension of its sovereignty throughout its territory, which must, of course, ultimately involve the withdrawal of all—I repeat, all—non-Lebanese forces from the territory of Lebanon.

28. So long as the forces of the United States are present in Lebanon under these conditions and in order to discharge these tasks—and they will remain there until these tasks are discharged—they will defend themselves against unprovoked attack from whatever quarter and by whatever means are deemed appropriate by the authorities of the United States.

29. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Israel.

30. Mr. BLUM (Israel): We have heard the two useful and helpful statements of the representative of Syria, the first on 18 October [*2480th meeting*] and the second today, and I say advisedly "useful and helpful" because the representative of Syria has finally clarified for all of us, including those who pretended to be ignorant in the past of the intentions of his Government, that Syria does not intend to withdraw from Lebanon.

31. In my statement on 18 October I made explicit reference to the demand voiced by the President of Lebanon from the rostrum of the General Assembly last year in which he called for—and I quoted him then and I am going to quote him again: "the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all non-Lebanese forces from Lebanon."[2]

32. I also made reference on 18 October to the letter of 2 September 1983 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Emigration of Lebanon to the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States [*S/15953, annex*] requesting the withdrawal of all non-Lebanese forces from Lebanon. The Minister repeated this demand in his statement in the general debate in the General Assembly.[3]

33. All this is being brushed aside by the representative of Syria. For us there is no surprise in this because we have known all along that Syria has had, for all these years, expansionist and annexationist intentions with regard to Lebanon. But now the mask has been removed and the truth is there for all of us to see. Therefore I say in all sincerity that we are grateful to the representative of Syria for his statement, and I believe the entire Council must be very grateful to him for it.

34. One who must certainly be grateful to him for his statement is the representative of Jordan, because he has been given a clean bill of health by the representative of Syria. Incidentally, I am also grateful for the Arabic proverb which he brought to our attention. I indeed believe that if a knave disparages me I must be right.

35. The statement of the representative of Jordan was predictable enough. As we all anticipated, he did not address himself to the issues raised in my statement earlier today [*2495th meeting*]. He told us, very predictably, that it was beneath his dignity—I wish he had cared for the dignity of the Chair last month as much as he cares for his own dignity—and he left it at that, basically. So in actual fact he only confirmed what I had to say earlier today. He certainly confirmed it when he told the Council—he really had the audacity to tell the Council—that he thought I did not have the right to speak here. That is precisely what he wanted to effect in his abuse of the Chair last month. That is why he invoked the lateness of the hour, 1.55 p.m. There was nothing wrong with that. What was wrong was that he did not set a date for a resumption of the debate—that afternoon, or the following morning, or the following afternoon. Well, the reason is now clear: he thinks I have no right to speak here. That is the proper exercise of the functions of the Chair. So in fact, by his statement today, he has only further compounded his misbehaviour. He had an excellent chance to show some remorse, to apologize to the Council for what he did last month. He did not utilize that chance. Instead, he embarked on a discourse on Israel being a non-peace-loving State. This is a favourite theme of his.

36. Since the resolution he referred to was adopted before his arrival here, I should like to acquaint him with certain facts. The resolution he referred to was adopted by such peace-loving States as Cuba, Iraq, Libya, the Soviet Union, its puppet régime in Kabul, Syria, Viet Nam and so on. Here at the United Nations, in this theatre of the absurd, all these countries masquerade as peace-loving States and, as I said at the time, it is indeed a badge of honour for my country to be branded by these countries a non-peace-loving State. The fact is that all the 21 States which voted against that shameful and shameless resolution were democracies, the leading democracies in our world. Not surprisingly, Mr. Salah's country was not among them.

37. I should like to say a few words also in response to the second statement by the representative of the Soviet Union in this debate.

38. I tried last time—unsuccessfully, it appears—to remind the representative of the Soviet Union that what was on our agenda was the extension of the mandate of UNIFIL. He departed last time from the agenda, and he decided to proceed on the same lines today. He raised certain questions. He knows very well that there are answers to those questions which are linked to certain other questions. Indeed, I made him an offer a long time ago. I have certain questions to ask of him, and once he has been good enough to reply to them he can be assured that our answers to his questions will be instantly forthcoming. He has not obliged me today with answers to my questions. I should therefore like to repeat some of them.

39. I ask the representative of the Soviet Union, the leader of the peace camp in our world, when his country's peace-loving tanks are going to leave Afghanistan. How

many more Afghan civilians will have to be killed by peace-loving Soviet troops before he will indicate his country's willingness to leave Afghanistan alone?

40. This is my next question to the representative of the Soviet Union: when will his country be ready to release from their bondage the various nations that it has enslaved over the past 38 years? I do not have to name those nations—first, because the list is a very long one and I do not want to detain the Council and, secondly, because the list is well known to all of us.

41. I should like also to ask the representative of the Soviet Union—and this is closer to his home: when will his Government be ready to grant the peoples of the Soviet Union their fundamental human rights and freedoms? In other words, when will his country cease being a totalitarian dictatorship? This is an important question because it has far-reaching repercussions for the peace of the world, including peace in the Middle East.

42. My next question is: when will the Soviet Union cease its attempts to subvert and destabilize various régimes throughout the world—mainly through mercenary régimes that it maintains in various regions? More specifically, when will the Soviet Union give up the attempts it has been making for three decades now in the Middle East to destabilize our region? This question, of course, concerns me most directly as the representative of a country in the Middle East. For, the Soviet Union has been instrumental in every escalation of tension in the Middle East over the past three decades, and certainly in recent weeks, through the introduction of huge quantities of sophisticated weapons and armaments and through the dispatch of thousands of "advisers" who now grace with their presence the invading armies of Syria in Lebanon. So when is this type of peacemaking by the Soviet Union going to cease in our region? As soon as it does cease, it will become much simpler to answer the questions he asked of me, because then we shall be able to sit down with our neighbours, unhampered by foreign interventionists from outside the region, to negotiate all the outstanding issues between us and them.

43. I conclude with two specific questions. Could the representative of the Soviet Union tell us whether the Soviet "advisers" currently in Lebanon with the Syrian army of occupation have obtained the necessary Lebanese visas? And, given the vast quantities of Soviet arms and ammunition in Lebanon, could he tell this Council whether the necessary import licenses have been obtained from the Government of Lebanon; and, if so, would he be good enough to produce at least one copy of such an important license?

44. The PRESIDENT: I believe that I have given all concerned every opportunity to state their views, and I hope that we shall be able to finish our meeting this evening in good time and in good order.

45. I call again on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

46. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I apologize for speaking once again, but I do so because I feel, as everyone else here must feel, that an attempt has been made to ascribe to me words that I did not use.

47. As usual, the representative of world zionism here claimed that I had said that the Syrian Arab Republic would not withdraw from Lebanon. I did not say that. He would like me to have said it. He would like to interpret my statement in a way compatible with the expansionist aims of Israel. But I said no such thing. I quoted from the verbatim record of the Council's meeting on 18 October, where I had read out a statement made by the President of the Syrian Arab Republic, Mr. Hafez al-Assad, in an interview with Swiss television. This statement is in the record for the representative of world zionism to read [*2480th meeting, para. 87*], but it seems that there is political illiteracy here—deliberate illiteracy. I shall quote again one passage from the statement by the President of the Syrian Arab Republic: "Israel must withdraw from Lebanon"—is that not compatible with resolution 509 (1982)?—"There is only one foreign army in Lebanon, and that is the Israeli army" [*ibid.*]. Can anyone deny that the Israeli army is a foreign army? If for the sake of argument we agreed that the Israeli army was not a foreign army, then the multilateral force is not a foreign force but an Arab or an Israeli force.

48. I repeat what I have already said: Israel must withdraw from Lebanon, since there is only one foreign army in Lebanon and it is the Israeli army, which came there as an invading force. Who invaded Lebanon? Did the Syrian Arab Republic invade Lebanon? Has the Security Council forgotten and has Israel forgotten that on 6 June 1982 the Council adopted a resolution calling upon Israel to withdraw all its military forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon? [*Resolution 509 (1982).*]

49. When Israel invaded Lebanon in 1978, was there a Syrian invasion? In its resolution 425 (1978) did the Council not call upon Israel to withdraw from Lebanon to internationally recognized boundaries? The Syrian forces are in Lebanon at the request of the Lebanese Government. The same paragraph of the verbatim report of the meeting of 18 October continues: "Israel has its own language and systems, in no way linked to Lebanon or any other Arab country" [*2480th meeting, para. 87*].

50. How can Israel be linked to Lebanon or to any other Arab country? It is an imported entity, a synthetic entity. How can it belong to the area when it has nothing to link it to Lebanon or to any other Arab country? The same paragraph continues: "The Israeli forces must withdraw from Lebanon without imposing any conditions on that country. The withdrawal of the Israeli forces will help to put an end to the Lebanese disputes, with the help of the Arabs" [*ibid.*].

51. Is there anyone in the world who doubts that the withdrawal of the Israeli forces will facilitate the solution of the Lebanese conflict, with Arab assistance? Have not

the Arab deterrent forces—that is, the Syrian forces—come to Lebanon in accordance with the wish of the Arabs?

52. The President said, with respect to the Syrian forces—and here I request the previous speaker to listen well so that he will not misquote me:

> "As far as the Syrian forces are concerned, the Syrian forces are prepared to withdraw at the request of the Lebanese Government after the withdrawal of the Israeli forces"—Does that mean that Syria will not withdraw from Lebanon; did I say that?—"because then it would be a request resulting from a decision by the Lebanese Government and not from Israeli pressure because of Israeli occupation in Lebanon." [*Ibid.*]

This is because we do not see that such a request, however it is made, can come from the will of the Lebanese—not as a result of Israeli pressure—as long as the Israeli occupation of Lebanon continues.

53. In other words, the text is very clear. The representative of Israel cannot interpret texts in accordance with his expansionist schemes. The Lebanese decision must be a free one. The freedom of the Lebanese decision stems only from the freedom of Lebanon, that is, through the full Israeli withdrawal and the lifting of the American hand from Lebanon.

54. It has been said that Syria receives military assistance. Naturally Syria receives military assistance. How can Syria not defend itself against the war machine, against the Israeli arsenal, which is nurtured by the United States with billions of dollars? Is not self-defence, in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, a natural right guaranteed for every State? Can Syria produce by itself the weapons to enable it to defend itself, while it is a developing State? Can Israel produce the American weapons by itself? No. The proof of this is found in *The New Times* of today, 11 November, under the heading "House Votes Aid for Israeli Plane":

> "American aid allocated to Israel for the 1984 fiscal year totals $2.61 billion, including 1.7 billion in military credits and $910 million in economic grants. Of the military credits, $850 million does not have to be repaid."*

55. Israel is a mendicant State, which lives off American aid—not off American loans, but off American aid—and off Arab properties and Arab resources and riches—and we are told here in the Council not to defend ourselves. The same article in *The New York Times* continues as follows:

> "This is the largest amount of aid ever approved for Israel. Last year, it got $2.485 billion."*

56. Can anyone challenge, as the representative of zionism did, our right to import the means for our self-defence from any place we wish? We import them from the party that combats expansionism, racism and aggression in the world. We do not import them from those who commit aggression against Grenada and plan to commit aggression against Nicaragua and commit acts of violation of Arab airspace and waters.

57. Moreover, Israel, through the American Government, is now competing with American companies in the manufacture of American aircraft in the occupied Arab territories—which is to say, Israel and the other occupied Arab territories. *The New York Times* went on to say:

> "The Lavie issue has been sharply disputed behind the scenes here. Some American companies, such as Pratt & Whitney and Grumman, which stand to gain from work on the Lavie, have supported the use of American funds. Other companies, such as Northrop, which view the Lavie as a competitor, have been opposed, particularly since the F-20, Northrop's fighter, has not been financed by the Government."*

58. The paper, which is not known for its friendliness towards the Arabs—it is controlled by world zionism, and this is no secret—continues:

> "The General Accounting Organization, the Congressional watchdog agency, said in a report last summer that the research and development costs for the Lavie are estimated in excess of $1.5 billion."*

59. Israel has become a place where American weapons are manufactured under Hebrew names and compete with American weapons which benefit the American Government through the sale of the weapons to other peoples to fight among themselves. This is the truth.

60. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Lebanon, on whom I now call.

61. Mr. FAKHOURY (Lebanon) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank you, Sir, for giving me the opportunity to make my statement and I wish you success in carrying out your task as President of the Council for the month of November. Your well-known wisdom and competence will be invaluable to the Council. I wish also to express our appreciation to your predecessor, Mr. Abdullah Salah, for having guided the work of the Council so skilfully last month.

62. We asked to speak at the Council's meeting on 18 October [*2480th meeting*] in exercise of the right of reply because we wished to put our position on record when the deliberations were diverted from the original subject—the extension of the mandate of UNIFIL—and developed to encompass other issues which in our judgement have a bearing on the sovereignty of Lebanon.

63. Today we note that the insistence on such a diversion still exists. This has strengthened our belief that it is

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

necessary to set out the position of Lebanon on what is being said, and on what has been said in the past, without indulging in polemics—a practice we hold to except when we are forced to speak out so that our silence may not be interpreted as approval of acceptance.

64. Lebanon's position can be summarized as follows. First, Lebanon holds firm to its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity and to the unity of its people. Secondly, the events which have taken place on Lebanese territory and are still taking place today are unquestionable proof that the war that has been raging for nine years is not, as some wish to portray it, an internal war, but a war of regional ambitions and conflicting international interests. Thirdly, the Government of Lebanon is determined to ensure the withdrawal of all unauthorized non-Lebanese forces from Lebanon. As for the multinational forces, UNIFIL and the international observers, we confirm that their presence in Lebanon is at the request and with the approval of the Lebanese Government. Fourthly, the international community and, especially, the Security Council are called upon—today, not tomorrow—to assist the Government of Lebanon to ensure the withdrawal of those unauthorized non-Lebanese forces, because this will relieve Lebanon of human tragedies, destruction and economic deterioration and protect the security and peace of the region and the world from the danger of war. Fifthly, the delegation of Lebanon, and that delegation alone, has the right to speak here in the name of Lebanon about Lebanon's future and about what it wants and what it rejects.

65. I say this in order to remove any doubt or misunderstanding that may have arisen as we listened to some of the representatives who appointed themselves caretakers of the interests of Lebanon in place of the Lebanese themselves, or to representatives who consider themselves to be more sincerely interested in the future of Lebanon and its security and stability than even the people of Lebanon themselves.

66. There are no, and shall be no caretakers of Lebanon except the Lebanese themselves, and no one shall be allowed to speak on behalf of Lebanon except its legitimate representatives.

67. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of the United States in his statement today said that the United States was not threatening anyone and that it had no intention of invading or attacking anyone. Those statements of his are in contradiction with the words and, more important, the deeds of the United States Administration.

68. In recent months all of us have seen some pretty ominous phenomena. As the military machine of the Pentagon is beginning to get up steam, and as American factories are churning out ever-increasing numbers of missiles, aircraft and tanks, the American philosophy is becoming more and more frank and open. In recent months at least five new postulates have appeared in the American philosophy. They are the following. The first postulate is that the world must be divided into spheres of influence and, furthermore, spheres of influence of the Western Powers. For this candour we are obliged to the President of the United States. The second postulate is that the United States has the right to conduct subversive operations against any country of the world whose régime is not to the liking of the United States. The author of this postulate is the President of the United States. The third postulate is that the Charter of the United Nations permits the United States to intervene, primarily in Grenada. For this postulate we may thank the permanent representative of the United States. The fourth postulate is that the list of American interventions has only just begun and may be continued. The authors of this postulate are the President of the United States and the United States Secretary for Defense.

69. All of this is nothing other than the philosophy of force, the philosophy of the jungle. The Administration that proclaims this philosophy and pursues a policy in accordance with it assumes full responsibility before mankind.

70. As for the statement of the representative of Israel, generally speaking, I need not necessarily answer him. After all, in the strategic partnership between Israel and the United States Israel is, as everyone knows, the junior partner, and the master has already been answered by me.

71. Nevertheless the representative of Israel intrigued me with some very concrete points he made about some very concrete issues. In particular, for example, he asked about the question of visas, and he also raised the question of permission for the import of arms. I am ready to continue to discuss these matters with him. But let the representative of Israel first show me Lebanese visas in the passports of Israeli soldiers now occupying southern Lebanon; let the representative of Israel show me the permission issued to it by the Lebanese authorities for the Israeli imports of the American weapons that are now to be found in southern Lebanon.

72. Mr. SALAH (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I am very grateful for the statement made by the Israeli representative this afternoon. So as to avoid the impression being given that he has a just cause, I should like to inform the Council that the best way in which we can answer Israel and reveal its nature and intentions is to draw attention to that statement by the Israeli representative himself. His statement this afternoon was explicit in that regard. Hence we see no need to prevent the Israeli representative from speaking continuously.

73. As for Israel's concern regarding the Council's importance, and Israel's respect for the Council, those can be judged from the Israeli representative's absence from the Council chamber to accept the invitation that you, Mr. President, extended to him to take a place at the Council table. He continues to abuse the opportunity that has been granted him. He proved that a short while ago, and in his last statement.

74. He once again repeated shop-worn talk about my person and the presidency of the Council last month in a

slander campaign aimed at diverting the Council from its agenda. Here I would record my thanks to those who have had sufficient moral courage to express objectively and honestly their awareness of that fact in this chamber.

75. In his last statement the representative as usual avoided the main problem that is engaging everyone's attention and threatening international peace and security. He merely insulted the Council. I think that it is an affront to the Council and to its presidency, whoever the President may be, that he should be allowed to be so bold as to insult the Council and its presidency in this manner.

76. Israel's respect for the Council and for the United Nations—and Israel was established by the Organization—was evinced long ago. We recall what the Israeli representative said on the eve of the unanimous adoption of a resolution condemning the Israeli raid against the Beirut International Airport on 31 December 1968 [*resolution 262 (1968)*]. When the Israeli representative submitted his Government's response to that resolution, he said:

> "The resolution reflects the moral, political and juridical bankruptcy of the Security Council in respect of the Middle East situation."* [*1462nd meeting, para. 118.*]

That was said by the representative of Israel in 1968, and that is what the representative of this entity has been repeating now in terms of substance and spirit.

77. Lastly, I can objectively make no better response to the Israeli representative than to re-read paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution A/ES-9/1, which I quoted this morning [*2495th meeting*] and in which it is stated that the General Assembly:

> "Declares that Israel's record and actions confirm that it is not a peace-loving Member State and that it has carried out neither its obligations under the Charter nor its commitment under General Assembly resolution 273 (III) of 11 May 1949;".*

78. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel.

79. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Irrespective of the number of interventions that the representative of Jordan may make, nothing will erase from the memories of the members of the Council and of public opinion outside the Council, which watches the proceedings in this Council, the gross misconduct that he displayed last month.

80. As I have already had occasion to say, he had the opportunity today to apologize to the Council. Instead he has posed as the defender of the Council's interests. He is apparently unable to justify his behaviour. He hides behind hollow generalities.

81. We are, of course, not surprised that, in accordance with the custom here, various speakers today dutifully congratulated him on his many virtues of last month, on his fairness, his impartiality, his honesty, his decency—any combination will do, especially when certain opportunists join the bandwagon. It was something different from what some of those representatives had to say about his behaviour in private.

82. With regard to the representative of the Soviet Union, I should like him to be advised that Israel signed with Lebanon an agreement on 17 May providing, *inter alia*, for the full withdrawal of Israel to the international boundary between our two countries, within the context of the agreement and subject to the fulfilment of all its provisions. I should like to ask the representative of the Soviet Union, does his country have an agreement of this kind with Afghanistan, for example, and, if so, what does it provide for? When does his country intend to remove the Soviet forces of aggression from that country? And what about the other countries that have fallen under Soviet sway all these years? Have they been assured by the Soviet Union of the restoration of their independence?

83. We could go on endlessly with these questions, and I should like the representative of the Soviet Union to note that the questions that could be asked of his Government are indeed legion. And there are many questions for which his Government has to answer the international community.

84. The PRESIDENT: As I said this morning, there were many items that the Security Council had to discuss last month, and therefore the time of the Council was taken up with those substantive issues. I hope that we are now finished with the procedural aspect of our debate.

85. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of Israel is interested in continuing the discussion, in the Security Council and throughout the world. But we want to put an end to the discussion. For this, it would suffice that Israel withdraw its troops from all Arab territories occupied since 1967.

86. Mr. SALAH (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The representative of Israel has given me the opportunity to apologize for what he calls my bias. I would say that Israel has missed dozens of opportunities to demonstrate its love for peace and it intention to withdraw from the occupied Arab territories.

87. As to his remarks, made as though he were divulging what was said to him in confidence by any other representatives I need only recall what has been said in public about the representative of Israel and about that entity itself.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

NOTES

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 9th meeting, para. 144.

[2] *Ibid., Thirty-seventh Session, Plenary Meetings*, 35th meeting, para. 10.

[3] *Ibid., Thirty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 14th meeting, para. 315.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-60205—August 1992—2,050